

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010126US1

MPS Ref. No.: IBMK10126

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated April 5, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on July 5, 2005. Applicants submit this response to place the application in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 3-8, 11-12, 16-19, and 22-23 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 3, 4, 5, 11, 16, and 22 have been amended. Claims 1-2, 9-10, 13-15, and 20-21 have been cancelled. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

The disclosure is objected to because of informalities. In the specification, paragraphs [0018] and [0020] have been amended to correct minor editorial problems. Paragraph [0022] has been deleted. The subject matter described in deleted Paragraph [0022] has been inserted in amended Paragraph [0031]. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 11, 12, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "if the GUI cannot be positioned". Applicants submit appropriate amendments have been made and believe that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 13-15, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr (U.S. Patent 5,428,733) and Grillo et al. (U.S. Patent 6,717,589, hereinafter *Grillo*). These claims have been cancelled, thus obviating this rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-8 and 16-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the

Page 10

350474_1

PATENT

Atty. Dkt. No. ROC920010126US1

MPS Ref. No.: IBMK10126

limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended claims 3, 4, 5, and 16 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 6-8 depend from amended claim 5, and claims 17-19 depend from amended claim 16. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 3-8 and 16-19 are now in condition for allowance and request withdrawal of this objection.

Furthermore, Examiner states that while claims 11, 12, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, an amendment to overcome the antecedent basis problems would place the claims in allowable form. Applicants submit appropriate amendments have been made. Applicants have amended claims 11 and 22 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 12 depends from claim 11 and claim 23 depends from claim 22. Accordingly, Applicants believe that claims 11-12 and 22-23 are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd, Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants